

(c) Remarks

The claims are 1-13 with claims 1, 7 and 9 being independent. The claims have been amended to better define the intended invention and to correct an informality unrelated to patentability and reconsideration thereof is expressly requested.

Support for recited particle size and refractive index of the functional material is found, inter alia, on page 18, lines 4-21. Support for the content of block polymer is found on page 15, lines 22-25 and support for content of functional material is found on page 17, lines 20-23. Support for the inorganic oxides as recited is found on page 18, line 7-14.

A revised Form PTO-1449 is enclosed to correct the entry "EP 022741" to read --EP 00227141-- in accordance with the document filed.

The Examiner objected to claim 6 in use of the term "high". Without necessarily agreeing or disagreeing and solely to expedite prosecution, claim 6 was amended to delete that term. Accordingly the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 were rejected as anticipated by Berge WO '198 and claims 6-10 were rejected as obvious over Berge WO '198. Claims 1-6 were also rejected as obvious over Saito '364 in view of Tomoki '585. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Prior to addressing the grounds of rejection applicants wish to briefly review certain key features and advantages of the present claimed invention.

The present invention includes a micelle-containing composition capable of forming a film having a highly uniform dispersion and transparency. As noted on specification pages 16-18, since the composition of the present invention contains a specific block polymer at an amount sufficient for dispersing the functional substance and

the block polymer is amphipathic, it is highly compatible with the polymer precursor. Further, the composition contains a specific amount of inorganic oxide particles having a particle size not greater than a specific upper limit and a refractive index within a specific range. The above features coact synergistically to provide the inventive composition which affords the above advantageous results.

With regard to the art rejection, Berge et al. (Berge '198) discloses a block polymer and polymer precursor. In Berge '198, however, a wide variety of substances are disclosed which can be deemed to correspond to the functional substance, including materials not included within the instant functional substances. Further, no disclosure or teaching is present as to a preferred range of particle size or content of the functional substance. The present invention provides advantageous results due to a synergistic interaction based on the kind and content of the block polymer, the property and content of the functional substance and the presence of the precursor. Berge '198 does not teach or suggest any such synergistic effects.

Sato et al. '364 merely discloses a block polymer of the present invention. Tomoki et al. (EPA '585) teaches curing a solution formed by dispersing inorganic fine particles in a curable substance. However, these references are directed to non-analogous technologies unrelated to each other and, accordingly, there is no motivation to combine such documents. Sato relates to ink-jet compositions for printing, while Tomoki deals with a non-analogous liquid crystal optical device with a curable liquid crystal layer. Further, neither of these references discloses or suggests the synergistic effect of the above features of the present invention.

Wherefore, the claims should be allowed and the case passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter Saxon/
Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NYMain 618015v1